UNITED
NATIONS

CAT

Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment

Distr.
GENERAL

CAT/C/SR.107
8 May 1992

ENGLISH
Original: FRENCH

COMMITTEE AGAINST TORTURE

Eighth session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 107th MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Wednesday, 29 April 1992, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. VOYAME

CONTENTS

Consideration of reports submitted by States parties under article 19 of the Convention (continued)

Initial report of Luxembourg

Exchange of views with the Board of Trustees of the United Nations Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Official Records Editing Section, room E.4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

Any corrections to the records of the meetings of this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

GE.92-12277/4463B

The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS SUBMITTED BY STATES PARTIES UNDER ARTICLE 19 OF THE CONVENTION (agenda item 7) (continued)

Initial report of Luxembourg (CAT/C/5/Add.29)

1. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Duhr, Ms. Konsbruck and Mr. Schockweiler (Luxembourg) took places at the Committee table.

2. Mr. DUHR (Luxembourg), introducing his country's initial report (CAT/C/5/Add.29), stressed that respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms was a genuine concern of the Luxembourg Government at the national, regional and world levels. At the national level, all public and individual rights and freedoms were guaranteed to the highest degree by the Constitution, the international conventions ratified by Luxembourg or internal legislation and regulations. The full application of those guarantees was demonstrated by the absence of any reference to Luxembourg in the accusations of human rights violations made each year by such respectable non-governmental organizations as Amnesty International.

3. At the regional level, Luxembourg was one of the European States militating for respect for human rights within three bodies. Firstly, within the Council of Europe, it participated in the formulation and application of major legal instruments for the improved observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms: the European Convention against Torture was broader in its scope than the United Nations Convention against Torture and permitted on-the-spot inspections. Secondly, Luxembourg participated in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, whose "human rights basket" had been the starting-point for the political developments which had led to the restoration of the rule of law in practically all European countries. Lastly, within the framework of European political cooperation, Luxembourg and its partners in the European Community had made respect for human rights throughout the world one of the mainstays of the Twelve's foreign policy, and Luxembourg had held the Presidency when a basic declaration on the subject had been adopted in summer 1991.

4. Lastly, at the world level, Luxembourg had signed and ratified, and was applying, all human rights covenants and conventions.

5. Despite that good record, he would be careful not to give his country a stamp of approval, which would make it both judge and jury. It was vital that assessment of the practical observance of human rights in various countries should also be a matter for bodies not coming under any national authority. The Committee's role in eliminating torture was vital, as were the possibilities for action provided for in the European Convention against Torture and those envisaged in the draft optional protocol to the United Nations Convention against Torture.

6. The late submission of Luxembourg's initial report was due to purely technical reasons: having ratified the European Convention on 1 August 1988, Luxembourg had, a fortiori, conformed strictly to the provisions of the United Nations Convention against Torture. Without prejudging the Committee's

assessment, it was possible that Luxembourg legislation could be perceived as offering room for improvement. The Luxembourg authorities which might, as appropriate, be given responsibility for adapting national legislation relied heavily on the comments and suggestions of members of the Committee; bringing Luxembourg legislation into line with the United Nations Convention was a process which would naturally take some time.

7. For that reason, the initial report before the Committee should be regarded as a preliminary evaluation; the Committee's assessment of the situation would be conveyed to Luxembourg. A Legislative Reform Commission composed of representatives of the Ministry of Justice and other judicial bodies had been set up with a view to the adoption of such measures as might be required by the United Nations Convention against Torture. In that connection, it might be appropriate to put back the deadline for the submission of Luxembourg's next periodic report so as to allow the Legislative Reform Commission sufficient time to introduce particular amendments to Luxembourg legislation that might be recommended by the Committee.

8. Mr. MIKHAILOV (Country Rapporteur) said he found the Luxembourg report detailed and concrete. However, there were some questions that remained unanswered, first and foremost the vital question of whether torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment existed in Luxembourg at the present time. The report contained only very brief and incomplete comments on that point.

9. Paragraph 1 of the report (CAT/C/5/Add.29) listed the conventions ratified by the Luxembourg Government, but there was no indication of how and by what means those instruments were incorporated in internal legislation and took precedence over it. In that connection, it was mentioned that some decisions were taken by Luxembourg's supreme judicial organ; he would like to have more precise information on those cases.

10. With regard to article 2 of the Convention, it would be useful to know whether Luxembourg legislation, and more particularly the Penal Code, made a clear distinction between torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading punishment under the Convention against Torture, on the one hand, and more generally defined treatment that an individual might inflict on someone else, on the other. The question was prompted by the fact that the Luxembourg Penal Code seemed to lay down very general rules rather than the specific provisions called for by the Convention.

11. Paragraph 32, relating to article 10 of the Convention, stated that article 257 of the Penal Code prescribed increased penalties for public officials or officers who were guilty of torture or cruel and inhuman treatment; however, the other provisions of the Penal Code referred to all persons who were guilty of such acts. In that connection, it seemed that the definition of torture contained in the Convention had not been followed. He wondered whether the Luxembourg Government intended to incorporate a specific provision on the subject in the Penal Code.

12. In that context, it would be interesting to have further particulars the penalties laid down in the Luxembourg Penal Code, and especially the content and limits of the penalty of hard labour for life. Moreover, he asked whether

the application of the death penalty was consistent with Protocol No. 6 to the European Convention on Human Rights. Lastly, it would be useful to have details of custodial penalties.

13. Paragraph 17 of document CAT/C/5/Add.29, relating to article 4 of the Convention, required elucidation in that it failed to make clear who was the perpetrator of the offence concerned. Furthermore, paragraph 34 relating to article 11 referred to three types of violations - crimes, offences and infringements; it would be interesting to know how it was decided that a particular violation fell into one or other of those categories.

14. Mr. SORENSEN (Alternate Country Rapporteur) noted with satisfaction that the report under consideration (CAT/C/5/Add.29), although brief, dealt with most of the basic issues; he would raise only a small number of points to which he attached particular importance.

15. Firstly, paragraph 4 of the report indicated that international standards always took precedence over national rules, even those post-dating them: that was an excellent principle but how, in practice, did judges, police officers, prison governors etc., have access to the texts of the instruments concerned, which could hardly be their bedtime reading? Moreover, what happened in the event of a discrepancy between national rules and international standards? While Luxembourg was a small country with a high level of education, it was difficult to imagine that a police officer would ponder that question in a specific situation.

16. Paragraph 8 of document CAT/C/5/Add.29 stated that the term "torture" was not defined either in the Constitution or in legislative texts. That was a good thing in that the term could be given a very broad interpretation, but on the other hand a problem arose since international conventions, which took precedence over Luxembourg legislation, contained a definition. There again, it would be interesting to know how Luxembourg struck a balance between international and internal law.

17. He had a general question to ask concerning article 2 of the Convention. In paragraphs 9 and 10 of the report, reference was made to violence against individuals and infliction of bodily harm. Luxembourg legislation thus placed strong emphasis on physical violence as opposed to mental violence, even though article 473 of the Penal Code, quoted in paragraph 11 of the report, spoke of "violence or threats". Since psychological torture could be among the worst forms of torture, it would seem wise to include that concept in the amendments that were to be made to the legislation; that would be consistent with the spirit of the Convention.

18. The information given in paragraph 13 of the report (CAT/C/5/Add.29) on the question of obedience was particularly interesting and the texts quoted were extremely well drafted. Was it possible to have recourse to a mediator in Luxembourg for such complex issues as those relating to obedience?

19. In connection with article 3 of the Convention, it was stated in paragraph 14 of the report that "expulsion may be ordered by the Minister of Justice"; he asked whether the Minister was the only person who could make such an order. With regard to paragraph 15 of the report, he questioned

Luxembourg's interpretation of article 3 of the Convention, for it seemed to consider that torture was practised solely for political reasons. In fact, however, torture was inflicted for many other reasons as well, and it was important not to expel a person to a State where he ran the risk of being subjected to torture. Information was required on what guarantees existed in that connection.

20. It seemed from a reading of paragraph 26 of the report that the Luxembourg law on extradition did not meet the Committee's requirements. Paragraph 33, relating to article 10 of the Convention, stated that the fundamental principles of democracy and respect of human rights were taught, a fact which he welcomed. Nevertheless, it appeared to him that those principles were rather too vague; in any instruction, it should be made clear that torture was a most serious violation of human rights. Similarly, although there was no faculty of medicine in Luxembourg, doctors should be given specific instruction in questions relating to torture.

21. He was particularly interested in conditions of detention; in that connection, paragraph 35 of the report stated that "Unless the interests of the investigation militate against it, the detained person may send a message to an individual of his or her choice". He inquired what those "interests" were. Moreover, he asked whether the prisoner could notify two persons of his choice, for instance a member of his family and his lawyer. With regard to the medical examination, could the prisoner be examined by a doctor of his choice? He would also like to know who was empowered to decide on an extension of detention beyond the 24-hour deadline.

22. His main concern regarding Luxembourg was conditions of detention, and particularly incommunicado detention. He asked a series of questions on that subject, notably whether a person placed in incommunicado detention could contact his lawyer; whether such a person was entitled to an open-air exercise hour; whether the decision to place somebody in incommunicado detention could be made by the prison governor, who might take such a measure as a punishment, for instance, or whether it was a judge that had to decide; whether incommunicado detention was limited in time; who reviewed the case once it had been decided to place a prisoner in incommunicado detention; what medical services were made available to incommunicado prisoners; whether doctors who visited a person in incommunicado detention came under the police or the prison service - a vital question, since a very pernicious practice seemed to exist in that respect; whether doctors could draw up objective findings and whether those findings were communicated to the prison governor or the judge; and, even more important, whether the person concerned could ask to be examined by a doctor of his choice.

23. With regard to article 14 of the Convention, he would like to know whether the State itself provided compensation or whether the victim had to take legal proceedings in order to obtain it.

24. Mr. EL-IBRASHI congratulated the Luxembourg delegation on the clarity of its report; nevertheless, he would like some further explanations. Firstly, in a system under which Luxembourg criminal law existed side by side with directly applicable international conventions to which Luxembourg was a party,

what happened in the event of an inconsistency between an article of a convention and Luxembourg criminal law? He would also like to know whether there was a court for deciding whether a law was constitutional.

25. Referring to article 2 of the Convention, he endorsed the remarks made by Mr. Sorensen, who had been surprised to see from the Luxembourg report that torture was apparently circumscribed to physical injury and violence, when psychological torture was also a serious matter with serious consequences. He also noted that, in the event of aggravating circumstances, the minimum penalty prescribed could be doubled; in that connection, he inquired about the maximum penalty.

26. With respect to articles 13 and 14, concerning redress and compensation, he would welcome some further details regarding the machinery involved. In particular, did the general rules of civil law, under which the victim was entitled to redress for injury sustained and loss of earnings, apply for the purposes of compensation for torture?

27. Mr. KHITRIN said he would like to see Luxembourg include in its Penal Code a specific and comprehensive definition of torture which would also prohibit psychological torture. He would also like to know how, in practice, an individual could invoke the provisions of the Convention, as indicated in paragraph 6, and in which Luxembourg law that clause appeared. He also inquired how the general public was informed of that specific right.

28. Further details should be given of the situation concerning the application of the various articles of the Convention, and particularly regarding conditions of detention and the duration of police custody, since the Committee would have difficulty in accepting the report as it stood without such information. He would also like to be informed more fully of the country's judicial structure and to know whether there was a clear separation between the executive and the legislature. Some clarifications on the status of judges and the legal status of the State Prosecutor and the Procurator General would also be useful.

29. Lastly, he would like to know which bodies were responsible for State security. Were they empowered to arrest someone and, if so, for how long? He would also welcome figures on offences and the prison population and information on conditions of detention.

30. Mr. BURNS said that many of the questions which he had intended to put had already been asked by his colleagues. He admitted that he had found it somewhat difficult to read the report. He would like further details concerning the structure of the judiciary, and in particular who was responsible for appointing and dismissing judges. In addition to the ordinary courts, was there a State Security Court? Similarly, were there police security bodies and, if so, were the laws relating to arrest and detention different for such bodies? He would also like to know whether the institution of habeas corpus existed in Luxembourg. As for the 24-hour custody deadline - a deadline which he welcomed, as being one of the shortest in existence - he asked who decided on its extension.

31. He expressed surprise at the existence of capital punishment and hard labour in Luxembourg. He would like to know which offences carried the death penalty and the number of persons sentenced to death and, if appropriate, executed in recent years. As for hard labour, he asked how many convicted prisoners were subjected to that regime and in exactly what circumstances that penalty was imposed. He also wished to know how many prisons there were in Luxembourg.

32. Articles 473 and 438 of the Penal Code, quoted in paragraphs 11 and 12 of the report, did not seem to penalize torture as defined in the Convention. Moreover, psychological torture was not mentioned in any provision.

33. He further emphasized that article 7 of the Convention must be read in conjunction with article 3. He recalled that article 7 enunciated the principle of universal jurisdiction. Luxembourg was therefore obliged to prosecute anyone responsible for an offence under article 4 of the Convention who could not be extradited to a State where there were substantial grounds for believing that he would be in danger of being subjected to torture. The last part of paragraph 26 was ambiguous, stating that Luxembourg courts did not, generally speaking, have jurisdiction over offences committed outside the national territory. Did the Luxembourg authorities nevertheless acknowledge an obligation in that regard?

34. The comment under article 14 (para. 38 of the report) was not very clear either. Was the victim of an act of torture entitled to full redress? Had the State established redress and compensation machinery that was independent of the torturer's resources?

35. Lastly, he noted that paragraph 39 said the same thing twice, namely that it was a principle that judges could not consider any evidence obtained by wrongful or unfair methods, but failed to give any indication of what the situation was in practice; the Committee would welcome an assurance that no confession obtained by torture (including mental torture in the form of threats) could be adduced as evidence, as well as a clarification of the meaning of the concept of "wrongful or unfair methods".

36. Mr. DIPANDA MOUELLE said he would welcome further information on the penalty of hard labour and how it was carried out. Was that penalty not contrary to the philosophy and spirit of the Convention and did it not in fact constitute inhuman treatment? With regard to the application of article 7 of the Convention, relating to universal jurisdiction, he asked how and under what provisions of the Code of Penal Procedure proceedings were brought. He also inquired how the mutual judicial assistance provided for in article 9 of the Convention was carried out in practice and whether such arrangements existed with countries with which Luxembourg was not bound by a treaty.

37. He also requested further details on police custody, for it was at that time that the risk of torture was at its height. How long did pre-trial detention last? What concrete measures were taken to monitor the situation of persons held in police cells and in prisons? Was there a commission responsible for such supervision? With respect to articles 12 and 13, he asked whether the officials responsible for discipline in prisons were armed, and what measures could be taken in the event of a mutiny. With regard to

article 14, the responsibility of the State was established, but it would be interesting to know whether victims could also apply to the criminal courts invoking the responsibility of an official and by what mechanism the State could be implicated.

38. On the subject of article 15, he would like to know whether there had been cases in which confessions had been obtained by wrongful or unfair methods. With regard, lastly, to the application of article 16, it would be desirable for the Luxembourg delegation to provide the Committee with texts on the treatment of prisoners. He inquired whether adults were separated from minors and women from men, whether there were high-security prisons and whether there had been any cases of torture and, if so, what penalties had been applied.

39. Mr. GIL LAVEDRA said that he was puzzled by the apparent lack of consistency between paragraph 20 and paragraph 22 of the report, dealing with the application of article 5. According to paragraph 22, and contrary to paragraph 20, it seemed that only the commission of certain offences by Luxembourg citizens abroad could justify proceedings being taken in the Grand Duchy. He also stressed the anachronistic nature of the penalty of hard labour, which was characteristic of the era of the industrial revolution of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and had met a demand for manpower. In the modern age, the concept of punishment had changed. Moreover, it was stated that a medical examination could be carried out at the request of the State Prosecutor or of the detained person or a member of his family, but how was that possible in practice if the person was held incommunicado?

40. In conclusion, he requested clarifications concerning police custody. He asked whether the person arrested must be brought before a judge once the 24-hour period mentioned in the report had expired and what was the validity of any statements made to the police.

41. Mr. BEN AMMAR said he was pleased to note that Luxembourg was not one of the countries commanding the attention of non-governmental organizations concerned by the problem of torture. He asked whether the application of article 2 was ensured even during a state of emergency. He further inquired whether there was a police code of ethics and whether Luxembourg had an institution bringing together representatives of the Government and members of humanitarian organizations which was responsible for ensuring respect for human rights and, inter alia, monitoring the situation in places of detention.

42. The CHAIRMAN agreed with other members of the Committee who had said that, in order to satisfy the Convention, Luxembourg legislation should penalize psychological torture: the Convention could not have direct criminal applicability since it did not provide any penalties. Luxembourg legislation also contained some gaps with regard to the application of article 3, concerning extradition, and articles 5 and 7, relating to universal jurisdiction; he wondered whether, in those two cases, the Convention could be held to be directly applicable. With respect to the application of article 6, paragraph 3, concerning the possibility for a detainee to communicate with the nearest appropriate representative of the State of which he was a national, paragraph 24 of the report stated that that provision was applicable in Luxembourg except where the person in custody was being held incommunicado

under a decision of the examining magistrate. However, the Convention did not provide for any exception of that kind, and that restriction thus seemed contrary to the Convention. With regard to the mutual judicial assistance provided for in article 9 of the Convention, it was stated in paragraph 30 that judges could comply with letters of request emanating from foreign judges only if they were authorized to do so by the Minister of Justice. He inquired what was the Minister of Justice's practice in that respect and whether he did in fact authorize compliance with letters of request.

43. The explanations given regarding the application of articles 11, 12 and 13 were not entirely satisfactory. In particular, nothing was said about the measures taken to ensure the impartiality of the investigation and to guarantee the protection of the complainant.

44. Noting that there were no more questions to put to the Luxembourg delegation, he asked the members of the Committee whether they agreed to defer consideration of Luxembourg's next report, as requested by the Luxembourg delegation, or whether they wished that report to be submitted by the scheduled date (October 1992) at the same time as the additional information and documentation that had just been requested.

45. Mr. DUHR (Luxembourg) thanked the members of the Committee for the interest they had shown in his country's report. While there were some legislative provisions that had not been updated, the death penalty had been abolished in Luxembourg by an act of 20 June 1979, having been applied for the last time in 1956. He also indicated that there was a single prison in Luxembourg.

46. He further recalled that the Secretary-General had requested the States parties reporting under various United Nations instruments to compile an introductory section containing general information for the bodies dealing with those instruments. The documents submitted by Luxembourg three weeks previously answered a good number of the questions put by members of the Committee, particularly on the organization of the judicial system. His delegation would therefore endeavour to reply to the questions that were not addressed in that document.

47. Mr. DIPANDA MOUELLE suggested that it would be appropriate to put back the date of submission of the periodic report so that account could be taken of the anticipated amendments to the legislation.

48. After an exchange of views, the CHAIRMAN said that the Committee would take a decision on the matter at its next meeting, after hearing the replies of the Luxembourg delegation.

49. The meeting was suspended at 11.50 a.m. and resumed at 12.10 p.m.

EXCHANGE OF VIEWS WITH THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE UNITED NATIONS VOLUNTARY FUND FOR VICTIMS OF TORTURE

50. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mrs. Odio-Benito, Mr. Harano, Mr. Tosevski, Mr. Wako and Mr. Walkate (United Nations Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture) took places at the Committee table.

51. The CHAIRMAN welcomed the members of the Board of Trustees of the United Nations Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture and expressed satisfaction at the fact that the Committee and the Fund were meeting concurrently during the present year, thus enabling them to have an exchange of views on their shared concerns. That practice should perhaps be institutionalized in the future. After inviting the Board of Trustees of the Fund to participate in the press conference which the Committee would be giving at the end of its current session, he introduced the new members of the Committee to the Board delegation and gave an account of the Committee's various activities.

52. Mr. WALKATE (United Nations Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture) welcomed the opportunity that had been given him, as Chairman of the Board of Trustees of a body seeking to assist torture victims, to meet with a committee whose task was to prevent that odious practice.

53. After outlining the activities of the Board of Trustees of the Fund, he said that the Board was currently meeting to formulate recommendations to the Secretary-General. To date, the Secretary-General had always accepted such recommendations, which was extremely encouraging. Another task of the Board was to examine and follow up projects submitted to it: there were currently 118 such projects, the great majority of them requiring decisions. The Board's annual session lasted eight working days, three or four of which were spent on hearings with project officers who came from all over the world to present their problems and their suggestions. That was a vital part of the session, since it enabled the members of the Board of Trustees to have a concrete idea of assistance for torture victims rather than simply approaching it in administrative terms.

54. There were still numerous financing difficulties and it would doubtless be desirable for the Committee against Torture to draw the attention of States parties to the Convention to the need to contribute, or to increase their contributions, to the Fund. Only a minority of States members of the United Nations participated in the Fund's financing. In that connection, he added that the Fund also received donations from non-governmental sources. An idea of the difficulties confronting the Fund could be gained from the fact that during the current year it had been requested to provide assistance of some US$ 3 million, whereas it had only US$ 1.5 million available; consequently, it could only accede to half of the requests submitted to it.

55. Moreover, the Fund's capacity had declined, partly because more and more torture victims were requesting assistance from the various aid centres, the most important of which were situated in Copenhagen, Paris, Toronto, London, Minneapolis, Buenos Aires and Santiago. The rise in the number of refugees was another factor that increased the number of persons that could be eligible to receive aid after being tortured. The Fund would endeavour to take advantage of the World Conference on Human Rights to obtain more voluntary contributions.

56. In order to educate public opinion on the realities of torture, the Fund had subsidized a film in French, prepared in cooperation with the "Havre" Centre in Paris. The Board of Trustees of the Fund would be happy to meet with the Committee against Torture at its future sessions if it was possible

to have the sessions of the two bodies coincide and hoped to be able to participate in the press conference to be given by the Committee at its current session.

57. Mr. EL-IBRASHI said he would like to know what were the procedures for torture victims wishing to approach the Fund and what criteria the Fund used in accepting applications. As the Fund became better known it would receive more and more applications: what was the answer to that dilemma? Moreover, how could a person tortured in his home country approach the Fund? Lastly, what did the Board of Trustees understand by "projects"?

58. Mr. WALKATE (United Nations Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture) said that the secretariat had prepared an application form which enabled the Fund to obtain precise information, particularly on the amount requested by a particular centre. The "projects" were activities by anti-torture centres and various non-governmental organizations, which could sometimes tend to several thousand torture victims.

59. With very few exceptions, the Fund did not entertain applications from individuals and did not assist individuals directly, since its main function was to finance organizations with a staff having the medical and social expertise to assist victims of torture. Applications were examined extremely thoroughly and the process entailed a great effort by the Fund, even though it placed great trust in the centres, which it had been partially financing for many years.

60. He added that, even if it were able to do so, the Fund would not finance all the activities of a centre, since it was dependent on voluntary contributions and could not therefore guarantee that such financing would continue. Lastly, as it became better known the Fund was certainly likely to be confronted with more applications; the only way out that he could see was to induce countries to consider being more generous.

61. Mr. HOUSHMAND (Representative of the Secretary-General) stated that, in certain cases, the United Nations could provide assistance to individual torture victims by steering them towards the nearest medical care and rehabilitation centre, with which the Secretariat then remained in contact in order to ensure follow-up.

62. Mr. SORENSEN said that money was the lifeblood of efforts to eliminate torture and that the Fund played a vital role in that connection, even though its means were limited. As an example, he mentioned the budget of the Copenhagen centre, which was estimated for the coming year at $6 million, or four times the total amount that the Fund had to distribute between the various centres.

63. He wondered whether the time had not come to stop financing the Fund from voluntary contributions and to finance it instead from the United Nations regular budget. The financing countries were not generally those that tortured, and the latter therefore had no financial incentive to end the practices whose victims were cared for by others.

64. Lastly, he inquired whether the Fund had designated representatives to the Preparatory Committee for the World Conference and the World Conference itself, where Mr. Mikhailov and himself would be representing the Committee against Torture.

65. Mr. WALKATE (United Nations Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture) welcomed the very astute remark made by Mr. Sorensen. It would indeed be highly desirable for the Fund to be financed from the United Nations regular budget; however, that would require a decision by the General Assembly, which would imply a political will on the part of States to take such action. In the meantime, it would be very useful for bodies such as the Committee against Torture and the Human Rights Committee to ask Governments whose periodic reports they considered what was the status of their contributions to the Fund. To that end, the Fund was ready to supply the Committee with figures for the contributions made by donor States since its establishment.

66. With regard to the World Conference, the Board of Trustees of the Fund wished to propose that, out of the two weeks that the Conference would last, about one hour should be set aside for a discussion on contributions to the Fund. He would shortly be meeting Mr. Blanca, who took a close interest in that question. The Board of Trustees would of course be represented at the Conference and looked forward to cooperating with the representatives of the Committee on that occasion.

67. Mr. BEN AMMAR suggested that collaboration between the Fund and the Committee against Torture should begin at the level of the regional preparatory meetings for the World Conference.

68. The CHAIRMAN thanked the members of the Board of Trustees of the Fund for coming to exchange views with the Committee and took note of the proposals made by Mr. Walkate. He asked whether a copy of the French film mentioned by Mr. Walkate was available.

69. Mr. PREMONT (Secretary of the Board of Trustees of the United Nations Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture) said that the film would not be marketed in video cassette form until it had been shown at various festivals and on television, but the Committee could view it when it wanted.

70. The CHAIRMAN thanked Mr. Prémont and added that the Committee would probably like to see that film during its current session.

71. Mrs. Odio-Benito, Mr. Hatano, Mr. Tosevski, Mr. Wako and Mr. Walkate (United Nations Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture) withdrew.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.